



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
109 TW ALEXANDER DRIVE
RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27711

DATE: April 17, 2019

PREPARED BY: Special Agent (b) (6), (b) (7) (C)

CASE #: OI-AT-2018-ADM-0122

CROSS REFERENCE #

TITLE: (b) (6), (b) (7) (C)

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
(b) (6), (b) (7) (C)	RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC	

VIOLATION(S): 18 U.S. Code § 1001 (False Statements)

ALLEGATION(S): On June 28, 2018, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Inspector General (EPA-OIG) received allegations from a complainant, (b) (6), (b) (7) (C)

(b) (6), (b) (7) (C) (OIG Hotline Complaint 2018-0327) concerning (b) (6), (b) (7) (C)

and (b) (6), (b) (7) (C). The complainant alleged the following:

- (b) (6), (b) (7) (C) had multiple personal appointments that (b) (6), (b) (7) (C) attended during work hours, daily/weekly (b) (6), (b) (7) (C) but (b) (6), (b) (7) (C) did not use annual or sick leave when (b) (6), (b) (7) (C) attended these appointments.
- (b) (6), (b) (7) (C) was out of the office 65 days in 2013, for which (b) (6), (b) (7) (C) did not utilize leave.
- (b) (6), (b) (7) (C) will claim to be teleworking, but (b) (6), (b) (7) (C) does not bring home a laptop.
- (b) (6), (b) (7) (C) has a reasonable accommodation, which allows (b) (6), (b) (7) (C) to fly first-class for work. However, (b) (6), (b) (7) (C) does not fly first-class for (b) (6), (b) (7) (C) personal travel.
- In March 2018, (b) (6), (b) (7) (C) traveled to Greensboro, NC, for a (b) (6), (b) (7) (C) meeting at the (b) (6), (b) (7) (C). However, (b) (6), (b) (7) (C)

CASE OI-AT-2018-ADM-0122

PREPARED BY:
SA (b) (6)

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 1 of 3

This report and any attachments are the property of the EPA Office of Inspector General, Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency. It and its contents may not be reproduced or disclosed without written permission. This report contains information protected by the Privacy Act and is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Disclosure of this report to unauthorized persons is prohibited. See 5 U.S.C. 552a.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) checked (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) website, and determined there was a (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) meeting held there in December 2017, but there was no such meeting in March 2018. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) sorority, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), held an event during the time (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was in (b) (6), (b) (7)(C).

- (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) frequently worked on sorority presentations and activities while at the EPA.
- (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) uses EPA time to attend local sorority functions.
- (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) uses (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA title to solicit funds for scholarships.
- (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) traveled to Washington D.C., and has family there, and did not fully attend the meeting or conference for which (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) traveled.

FINDINGS: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was interviewed concerning the allegations (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) made against (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). From February 2015 through August (b) (6), (b) (7)(C).

The investigation revealed (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) is on a compressed work schedule, and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) scheduled work hours are Monday through Thursday from 9:00AM to 6:30PM; 9:00AM to 5:30PM on every first Friday, and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) is off work every second Friday. Review of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Personal Identity Verification Card reports at RTP, and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) timesheets from January 1, 2016 through February 22, 2019, revealed (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) reported to work on 147 occasions after 9:30AM, and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) did not report leave on (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) timesheets. The investigation is unable to confirm the time (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) left work the days (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) arrived to work after (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) scheduled reporting time.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) were interviewed concerning the allegations made against (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) supervised (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) from February 2005 through January 2018. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) never observed any irregularities concerning (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) time and attendance, and they never received any complaints from (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) employees concerning (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) time and attendance. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) said many of the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) work late hours until 7:00PM or later, and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) observed (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) in the office at 7:00PM or later.

From 2011 through 2018, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) worked with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) in (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) professional colleague (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). From 2011 through 2018, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) admitted that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) arrived to work late thirty minutes after 9:30AM on an average of two to three times per week, and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) continued to arrive late to work after 9:30AM. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) never confronted or counseled (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) for reporting to work late after (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) scheduled reporting time, because (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) produced (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) work, and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) observed that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) often works later hours after 6:00PM.

CASE OI-AT-2018-ADM-0122

PREPARED BY:
SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 2 of 3

This report and any attachments are the property of the EPA Office of Inspector General, Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency. It and its contents may not be reproduced or disclosed without written permission. This report contains information protected by the Privacy Act and is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Disclosure of this report to unauthorized persons is prohibited. See 5 U.S.C. 552a.

Review of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) emails, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) outlook calendar, and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) timesheets revealed (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) sent numerous emails during the days (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) reported that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) teleworked.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) have never known (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) to use (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA title for matters unrelated to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) work at the EPA, or attend an organizational event during (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) work hours that was unrelated to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) work at the EPA.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) local and national reasonable accommodation file were reviewed. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

The investigation revealed (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) received an invitation to attend a (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Meeting from March 15-16, 2018 at (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). The investigation revealed (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) requested (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) permission to attend the meeting, and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), the Designated Agency Ethics Official for (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) approved (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) to attend the meeting (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) confirmed with the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) attended the meeting.

DISPOSITION: There was no sufficient evidence obtained during the investigation that could support the complainant's allegations. Therefore, it is recommended this investigation be closed.

CASE OI-AT-2018-ADM-0122

PREPARED BY:
SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 3 of 3

This report and any attachments are the property of the EPA Office of Inspector General, Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency. It and its contents may not be reproduced or disclosed without written permission. This report contains information protected by the Privacy Act and is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Disclosure of this report to unauthorized persons is prohibited. See 5 U.S.C. 552a.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
1301 CONSTITUTION AVE, NW, SUITE B140
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

DATE: May 24, 2019

PREPARED BY: SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE #: OI-HQ-2017-CFR-0085

CROSS REFERENCE #:

TITLE: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)	ARLINGTON, VA	(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)	ARLINGTON, VA	(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)	ARLINGTON, VA	(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)	ARLINGTON, VA	(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)	WASHINGTON, DC	(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

POTENTIAL VIOLATIONS:

18 U.S. Code § 201 Bribery of public officials and witnesses

Prohibits public officials from accepting bribes or gratuities to influence their Government actions.

18 U.S.C. § 208 Acts affecting a personal financial interest

The basic criminal conflict of interest statute, prohibits an executive branch employee from participating personally and substantially in a particular Government matter that will affect his own financial interests, as well as the financial interests of:

- His spouse or minor child;
- His general partner;
- An organization in which he serves as an officer, director, trustee, general partner or employee; and
- A person with whom he is negotiating for or has an arrangement concerning prospective employment.

EPA's Appendix-Guidance on Corrective Discipline, EPA ORDER 3120.1

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 1

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency: it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.

45. Scientific misconduct

- a. Fabrication or knowing falsification of data, research procedures, or data analysis.
- b. Plagiarism or other misrepresentation, in proposing, conducting, reporting, or reviewing research or other scientific activities. This includes the deliberate misstatement or omission of material information.
- c. Ordering, advising, or suggesting a subordinate engage in scientific misconduct.

Scientific activities include research and development, technical and regulatory support, monitoring, data collection, review and interpretation of technical studies and assessment of health and environmental risk.

EPA's scientific activities include the review and interpretation of technical studies and assessment within program offices. The nature of the task, not the job classification of the individual performing the work, determines whether a particular activity is "science". Scientific misconduct does not extend to the interpretation of accurately stated scientific information, even when such interpretation is not widely accepted.

ALLEGATIONS:

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Office of Inspector General (OIG), received a Hotline referral (2017-0171) containing news reports and information concerning former EPA employee (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED] PA, Washington, DC.

The complaint alleged (b) (6), (b) (7) [REDACTED] may have colluded with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED]. Specifically, that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED], as (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED], may have violated criminal statutes and EPA Scientific Integrity Policy regarding the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED] s decision to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED].

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED] is the subject of civil litigation suggesting (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED]. News reports of the litigation suggested (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED] accepted monetary benefit from (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED] to influence the EPA's classification of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED], illegally released the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED] report, and stopped the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED] from publishing a (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED].

After reviewing the information, the EPA Inspector General requested the EPA OIG Office of Investigations initiate an inquiry to determine if there was any wrong doing on the part of EPA employees involved in the matter. After examination of the allegations, predication existed to conduct an investigation.

During this investigation, the EPA OIG received additional allegations of misconduct by EPA employees and included the following allegations in its examination:

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 2

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.

- In 2013, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) concealed receiving a letter from deceased EPA scientist (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) alleging EPA employees and members of the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) engaged in scientific fraud and a cover up regarding (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
- EPA employee (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was in possession of evidence (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) accepted kickbacks from EPA contractor Dynamak.
- EPA employee (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
- EPA employees (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) covered up critical data in the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) SAP.
- EPA employees in (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) manipulated (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stock prices to benefit themselves and their relatives. That (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) leaked the 2015 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) report stating (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stock went up 25% in 3 weeks. The writer alleged (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) employees and relatives of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) managers made a fortune on the stock market.
- (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Charlestown, West Virginia trip to address (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) shareholders was paid for by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
- EPA employee (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) may have authored the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) regarding (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) employee misconduct.

FINDINGS:

The EPA OIG examined allegations involving EPA employees. This investigation included employee and witness interviews, a comprehensive review of agency records and employee email accounts, a review of employee personnel records, a search of financial databases, and employee disclosures under the agency ethics guidelines.

The EPA OIG also conducted a review of financial disclosure reports for employees identified in this investigation as having been involved in the glyphosate risk assessment. This investigation revealed no information (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) employees were in violation of agency guidelines pertaining to conflicts of interests, scientific misconduct, or committed any of the alleged crimes attributed to them.

DISPOSITION: Allegations Not Supported; Inconclusive; Closed.

This investigation found none of the allegations against (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) employee misconduct were supported.

This investigation found the allegation (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) may have authored the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and subsequent communications regarding (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) employee misconduct inconclusive.

This matter is considered closed.